DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 862 HE 023 817

AUTHOR Bliss, Traci; Lisi, Penelope L.
TITLE The Effect of State Initiatives on School/University Partnerships in Connecticut.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization (Rockport, ME, May 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Program Development; *Shared Resources and Services; *State Standards; *Teacher Education Programs; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

This study examined factors that have contributed to the development of school/university partnerships in Connecticut, and identified obstacles to partnership activities. The research design included review of collaborative activities required by State Department of Education standards at 12 Connecticut teacher education programs. The standards required that the teacher education programs: (1) establish cooperative arrangements with elementary and secondary schools; and (2) develop management plans for the delivery of services to local school districts, describing types of services, staffing, resource support, and evaluation of service activities. In addition to the program reviews, three Connecticut collaborative projects at different stages of development were studied, and a survey was conducted of 11 deans or department chairs of teacher preparation programs. It is concluded that the three major factors contributing to the development of partnerships appear to be faculty and institutional commitment, additional funding support, and program approval standards. Appendices contain a copy of the survey form and tables of responses, case studies of the three collaborative projects, and a list of member institutions of the Connecticut Association of Colleges and Universities of Teacher Education. Includes three footnotes and a bibliography of three items. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322862

The Effect of State Initiatives on School/University Partnerships in Connecticut

Traci Bliss, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Institute for Effective Teaching
Connecticut Department of Higher Education

Penelope L. Lisi, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Center for Educational Excellence
Connecticut State University

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Rockport, Maine, May 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
PENELOPE L. LISI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 023 817

The Effect on State Initiatives on School/University Partnerships in Connecticut

Introduction

The "seamless web" in education. We have heard about it. We say we are committed to developing it. State mandates have required it. Money and other resources are increasingly devoted to it. But what is it? What really constitutes a partnership? Why, given the pressing and critical needs on all levels of education, should partnerships be a priority?

Ernest Boyer (1986) of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching states, "Education involves many relationships at many different levels, and, in the end, all of these linkages must be strong. If they are not, the chain will snap and the nation will suffer an unbearable loss of education effectiveness."(1) Other prominent national educators such as John Goodlad contend that if problems in education are to be solved

effectively, they must be addressed by collaborations committed to the simultaneous renewal of public schools and the programs that prepare our nation's teachers.

Response to this increasing demand for collaborative approaches in education has been mixed. The National Directory of School-College Partnerships: Current Models and Practices (1987), lists an impressive array of collaborative arrangements across the nation. And yet, when viewed on a state-by-state basis, activity is sporadic. Connecticut, which has gained national prominence in areas such as teacher assessment and salary increases, is an example of unevenness in the area of school/university collaboration.

For example, within the State there is a handful of outstanding projects in which schools and universities share resources to solve mutually defined problems. The Yale/New Haven Teachers Institute, now beginning its second decade, and the Wesleyan PIMMS program have become national models of successful and far-reaching collaborations. Both draw upon university resources and expertise to enable public school

teachers to increase their knowledge relevant to their teaching fields. In contrast to these well established, highly visible partnerships is the fact that half of Connecticut's 13 teacher preparation programs have either moderate or no activity in the area of collaboration.

In order to encourage more widespread collaborative activity that is sustained over time the Connecticut State University Center for Educational Excellence (CEE) and the Department of Higher Education's Institute for Effective Teaching (IET) have on-going projects to help colleges and universities respond to the needs of local schools. Both organizations were established in 1987 for the purposes of supporting innovation in the state's teacher preparation programs. Each promotes and funds partnership activities consistent with Maeroff's five principles of collaborative projects. (2) First, educators in the schools and colleges must agree that they do, in fact, have common problems. Second, in order to achieve effective collaboration, the traditional academic "pecking order" must be overcome. Additionally, collaborative projects must be sharply focused; and those who participate must receive recognition. Lastly, for school/college collaborations to work, they must focus on action and not machinery.

The following are some examples of the types of partnership projects the two organizations sponsor. In 1989, the University of Connecticut in collaboration with E.O. Smith High School, received $12,000 from the Institute for Effective Teaching to develop a multidisciplinary approach to the training of social studies teachers, "From Academic Major to Social Studies Classroom." With a similar size grant, Western Connecticut State launched an experiential curriculum in the Danbury Public Schools. The goal of the program has been to help students understand and use scientific and mathematical reasoning in addressing complicated problems. The program is now firmly in place, with dozens of Danbury teachers having been trained by Western Connecticut faculty in the use of LEGO TC Logo technology.

During 1990, five collaborative ventures in multicultural education received funding from the Center for Educational Excellence. Among these are a team teaching project, a minority mentoring and recruitment into teaching project, and a project to link the Hispanic and university communities in Willimantic.

The Research Question

In a context of rapidly changing public policy, new avenues of support, and new demands placed on teacher preparation programs, it seemed essential for the Center and the Institute to collaborate on exploring the nature and depth of partnership activity in Connecticut and determine how best to support future endeavors. In 1989, the two organizations collected relevant information about partnerships with the intent of developing a compendium for publication.

However, data revealed that only a third of the institutions were involved in collaborations that conform to the characteristics outlined by Maeroff. Another third were making inroads into the area and the final group had yet to undertake collaborations. The intriguing question then became, what factors have contributed to the development of school/university partnerships in Connecticut? In exploring this question, we were also interested in identifying obstacles to partnership activities.

Research Design

Since the main objective of exploratory research is to narrow the spectrum of possible explanations for a particular situation or situations, in this case factors contributing to or inhibiting partnership activities, we have used an exploratory research design. Generally, the goal of exploratory research is to generate hypotheses which can be tested in follow-up research. Here, our conclusions are primarily for the purpose of recommending policy directions. However, further research is not precluded.

The research design consisted of three parts, each contributing a certain perspective on the issues involved in school university partnerships: a summary of relevant sections of the Program Approval Reports from twelve of the thirteen teacher education programs, three case studies of partnerships, and a 1990 survey of the deans and chairpersons of teacher education programs.

Research Results

PROGRAM APPROVAL REPORTS

Beginning in 1984, the State Department of Education included in the program approval review process, two standards specifically aimed at collaborative activities (3):

Standard 1.7: Cooperative arrangements with elementary and secondary schools are sought and established

Standard 1.8: A management plan for the delivery of services to local school districts has been developed that includes: 1) types of services to be delivered, 2) staffing (e.g., release from teaching assignments, differentiated staffing, additional financial remuneration, team approaches to service, and 3) resource support and evaluation of service activities.

Between 1984-89, 12 of the 13 teacher education institutions had formal program approval visits to assess compliance with these and other established standards. Concerning the standard relating to cooperative arrangements, visiting teams were primarily concerned about a strong relationship with cooperating teachers to ensure a quality student teaching experience.

An examination of the dozen program approval reports showed that five of the smaller programs, including one public university, met Standard 1.7 (requiring cooperative relationships) with distinction, six met the standard sufficiently, and one did not meet the standard sufficiently.

Cumulative data on the standard concerning a management plan showed that it was a far more difficult standard to meet. Five schools met the standard sufficiently, six did not meet the standard sufficiently, and one private university met the standard with distinction. Reviewing the various programs' written responses to this standard, and in interviews with several deans and department chairs, there was considerable

difference of opinion as to what was expected by the standard. "Without an example of an acceptable management plan, it is difficult to know what is required" was a frequent comment. Nonetheless, since receiving ratings of "insufficient" on the standard, four of the six schools have undertaken far reaching collaborative projects, which include significant amounts of external funding.

CASE STUDIES

As previously mentioned our original intention, during the spring of 1989, was to produce a compendium describing the partnership activities at each of the 13 teacher preparation institutions. However, since fewer than half the institutions had working partnerships, we selected three collaborations to describe in detail. We based the selection on two items: the projects represented substantial yet different levels of partnership activity and the individuals involved were willing to cooperate with us.

The descriptions included in the appendix briefly describe three collaborations at very different stages of development:

the New Haven/Yale collaboration has been in process for less than a year, the Roberts Avenue Elementary School/Western Connecticut State University project is in its second year; and the Flanders Elementary School/Connecticut College program was initiated four years ago. Each case shows a distinct process for planning and implementing the partnership; as a whole, they represent a range of institutional involvements. The projects have two characteristics in common: the commitment of at least one key higher education faculty member or department chair and the use of external funding. (See Appendix B for Case Studies)

SURVEY ON PARTNERSHIPS IN CONNECTICUT

The third component of the research on partnerships was a survey conducted in March 1990 (Appendix C). The survey was designed to gage the current level of faculty interest in partnership activity, obstacles to undertaking such activity, and to elicit an indication of future priorities. The survey was mailed or given directly to all deans or department chairs of the teacher preparation programs. Eleven of the thirteen institutions responded to the survey.

In analyzing the responses to the survey questions, it must be remembered that these are self reports and the data should be seen in this light. Institutions certainly desire to be seen as taking a proactive stance in such areas as partnerships with local schools. Resource limitations prevented us from surveying schools to understand their perceptions of university initiative in this area.

In response to the questions on the survey, concerning change in the level of partnerships during the last five years, the majority of respondents (73%) believed that there has been steady or substantial on-going activity. The remaining 27% believed that there has been some increase in activity. Faculty commitment to partnerships is characterized by 64% of the respondents as average and by the remaining 36% as strong. (See Appendix D for tables of responses to each question.)

When asked about the priority of partnership, 9% of the respondents indicated that this is a low priority. However, 64% gave this a medium-level priority and 27% indicated that partnership development has a high priority in their departments.

An open-ended question asked respondents for reasons prompting departments to undertake partnerships. Three programs each cited institutional initiative, a single faculty member's initiative, or the realization that partnership activity is an essential need in education. Two institutions cited regulations issued by the State Department of Education, accreditation requirements, and support provided by outside agencies (e.g., the CEE and IET). Strong leadership, service, and research were each cited by one institution.

Respondents also were asked to cite major obstacles to developing partnerships. The majority of respondents (73%) cited lack of time and 64% indicated that lack of funding support impeded partnership development. Lack of faculty availability or interest was cited by 55% of respondents as an obstacle and 18% cited bureaucracy as an obstacle.

The degree to which program approval standards influence the decision to initiate partnership activities was none for 9% and low for 36% of the respondents. However, forty-five percent (45%) of the respondents indicated that the standards influenced the decision somewhat, and 9% indicated that they influenced the decision highly.

When asked what priority the CEE and the IET should give to supporting partnership activities in the future, 9% of the respondents indicated that it should receive no priority and 9% said it should receive a low priority. Twenty-seven percent (27%) or the respondents believed the organizations should give it a medium priority and 55% indicated a high priority.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate their top three choices for support of partnership activities. Eight of the eleven institutions indicated that support should come in the form of incentive awards and seven want a conference on school restructuring. Half of the programs are interested in more of the kind of activities that have been provided by the IET and CEE; e.g., information on successful collaborations, opportunities for interaction with nationally-recognized experts, and workshops for developing partnerships. None of the institutions expressed interest in sponsored faculty research to examine partnerships.

A review of the responses were made to ascertain whether or not a correlation existed between any of the items and the size or leadership of a program. None of the items on the surveyed appeared to be strongly associated with one another.

Conclusions

Overall, the three major factors contributing to the development of partnerships appear to be faculty and institutional commitment, additional funding support and program approval standards.

Another consideration, although not necessarily a factor, is the size of a program. Some of the smaller programs, both public and private, appear to be the farthest along in the development of partnerships. However, this does not apply to all small programs in the state, some of which have very little partnership activity. Also, some of the largest institutions have initiated broad-based partnerships which have just recently begun to emerge. It may be that the small size of a program allows for frequent communication, fewer levels of bureaucracy and hence, greater flexibility in "moving" the partnership along.

The personal commitment of Deans and program chairs (i.e., leadership) appears to be an important factor. For example,

three schools in the state that have thriving partnerships are Connecticut College, Wesleyan University and Yale University. This was reflected in the program approval standards as well as in our interview and survey data. Since the early 1980s, these schools have been part of a voluntary group of 16 Northeast liberal arts colleges known as the Consortium for Excellence in Teacher Education. Meeting twice a year, the group explores common issues and commitments, not the least of which are partnership activities with local schools. The directors of each of these programs have been instrumental in the development of programs with local schools and each attributes it to a strong personal commitment in addition to having developed a basis of trust with one or more local schools.

This type of personal commitment would also characterize the leadership at Western Connecticut State University. As a result of a state program review in 1989, the University received a very strong commendation for its cooperative arrangements with local schools. However, there is another significant factor in the WESConn partnership process. In 1985, the University did not meet sufficiently the two state standards relating to partnerships and the newly appointed Dean of Professional Studies was a strong advocate of collaborative programs.

Western Connecticut State University is an example of what appears to be the impact of program approval standards. When a program receives an insufficient rating in the areas of partnerships and has a leader committed to the concept, dramatic shifts begin to occur. While it is not possible to conclude that standards are either necessary or sufficient for the development of partnerships, they do appear to either force or accelerate change in cases of non-compliance.

Another factor, in addition to leadership, which seems to be necessary for partnership activities is additional funding. The funding does not need to be significant, but rather sufficient to pay for some portion of time for college and university faculty members to work with local districts. Additional outside funding provides an incentive which all of the schools surveyed consider a high priority.

The need for outside funding probably would not be necessary if opportunities for promotion included an emphasis on faculty work with local schools. Because this is not the case, external financial incentives continue to be instrumental to the development of partnerships.

Through a combination of regulations and incentives, the state has catalyzed considerable activity between colleges and

universities and surrounding schools. Some of the prominent partnerships, particularly those at private liberal arts colleges would have flourished without state intervention. But the majority of programs have expanded their collaborations through state funding and other types of assistance. What should be the continuing role of the state?

Future Directions

Connecticut's program approval standards should continue to require services to and programs with local districts. In addition, some incentive grants should be made available to those institutions which have yet to initiate a partnership but have a well conceived plan for doing so. However, the primary role of the state should now be to help colleges and universities to reward partnership activities within the institutional framework. Clearly, the need for outside funding would become considerably less if the institutions themselves provided incentives and recognition for faculty to engage in activities designed to improve local schools. At present much time is spent pursuing outside funding, primarily for faculty

release time. While outside funding allows for considerable creativity and experimentation it shouldn't be a necessary condition for partnerships, as it appears to have become.

During the next six months, the IET and CEE will recommend to our respective boards a 1990-1991 project to develop a series of recommendations pertaining to the tenure system and how faculty can be appropriately awarded for work with local schools. The current momentum neither should nor can be maintained by state initiatives alone. Rather sustained collaborations will require a very proactive role on the part of colleges and universities: a long term investment in the "seamless web".

NOTES

1) Ernest Boyer in School and College: Partnerships in Education (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1986).

2) Gene I Maeroff, School and College: Partnerships in Education, (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1986).

3) Connecticut State Department of Education, Standards and Procedures for Approval of teacher Preparation Programs, (Hartford, Connecticut 1984).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Levine, Marsha. Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model. Center for Restructuring American Federation of Teachers. Washington, D.C. 1988

Maeroff, Gene I. School and College: Partnerships in Education, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton University Press, Lawrenceville, NJ, 1986.

Wilbur, Franklin P., Leo M. Lambert, and M. Jean Young. National Directory of School-College Partnerships, Current Models and Practices, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C. 1987.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Member Institutions of the Connecticu. Association of Colleges and Universities of Teacher Education

Appendix B: Case Studies

Appendix C: Survey to Deans and Department Chairs in Spring 1990

Appendix D: Tables of Responses to Survey Question, Spring 1990

APPENDIX A

CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF TEACHERS

1. Eastern Connecticut State University
   83 Windham Street
   Willimantic, Ct. 06226

2. Western Connecticut State University
   181 White Street
   Danbury, Ct. 06810

3. CT College in New London
   New London, Ct. 06320

4. University of Bridgeport
   680 Millhill Rd
   Southport, Ct. 06490

5. St Joseph's College
   1678 Asylum Ave.
   West Hartford, Ct. 06117

6. Yale University
   Box 1604 A
   New Haven, Ct. 06420

7. University of Connecticut
   Box U-93
   Storrs, Ct. 06269

8. Southern Connecticut State Univesity
   501 Crescent Street
   New Haven, Ct. 06510

9. Fairfield University
   North Benson Road
   Fairfield, Ct. 06430

10. Sacred Heart University
    5151 Park Avenue
    Fairfield, Ct. 06432

11. Central Connecticut State University
    1615 Stanley Street
    New Britain, Ct. 06050

12. University of Hartford
    West Hartford, Ct. 06117

13. Weslyan University
    Middletown, Ct. 06457

APPENDIX B

CASE STUDIES

Teacher Education in the Language Arts: Connecticut College, Department of Education, and Flanders Elementary School, East Lyme, Ct.

In the mid-1980s, the Connecticut College Education Department and the Flanders Elementary School launched a joint project to broaden teachers' knowledge base and improve instructional practices in the language arts. From its inception, the project was characterized by a strong mutual commitment to collaboration and shared decision-making. For example, the focus on language arts grew out of several months of brainstorming sessions between the, Chairperson of the Connecticut College Education Department, the Principal of Flanders Elementary School.

A key objective of the project was to serve both student teachers from Connecticut College and experienced teachers at Flanders Elementary School, and the operational plan proceeded with both institutions fully involved in all aspects of the project. As a result of the initial brainstorming sessions, the two administrators submitted and received funding under the model schools' program of the State Department of Education. The grant was used to sponsor a full-time, week-long summer institute led by the two administrators and two faculty. The team of four worked with teachers, tutors, curriculum specialists and librarians. For an entire week at Flanders School and at Connecticut College, this specific community of learners explored a variety of approaches and materials for the teaching of language arts, including storytelling, drama, creative uses of wordless films and shared reading with Big Books.

During the semester following the summer institute, Connecticut College student teachers were prepared using the same concepts and approaches that Flanders' veteran teachers learned during the summer. The Principal at Flanders', was hired as the language arts instructor at Connecticut College, a critical component in establishing a consistent knowledge base among beginning and veteran teachers. When nine Conn College juniors and seniors began student teaching at Flanders, there was a sense of "built-in" support and collegiality given the common training in the language arts. Eighteen teachers served as cooperating teachers, some working with student teachers for seven weeks, other for a three-week period. Since all Flanders' instructional staff, including cooperating teachers, had been involved in the summer training, the particular emphasis on language arts was becoming part of the school culture.

The collaboration has continued to grow and develop in several mutually beneficial directions: Significant changes have occurred in language arts instruction at Flanders and within the Conn College teacher education program. Flanders' parents have expressed their support for the improvements in language arts teaching, and staff have become more involved in curriculum decision-making.

Observations: The collaboration required a considerable time investment by the two key administrators. However, the time spent, particularly in the initial brainstorming sessions, appears to have been essential to the success of the collaboration. The partnership and interdependence between the two institutions was maintained in all areas having to do with the teaching of language arts, including community relations. For example, the two institutions made joint presentations to the local school board and to the parents with children attending Flanders.

Since all Flanders faculty and staff have embraced

innovative instructional approaches in the language arts, student teachers are not merely 'allowed' to use these methods but supported and coached in their attempt to do so. To a certain degree, what is occurring at Flanders coincides with efforts by national organizations to develop professional practice schools. According to a report by the American Federation of Teachers, Center for Restructuring, (Levine, 1988) "developing professional practice schools will be an important piece in the school reform picture. They can play three important roles: 1) as exemplars of good practice; 2) as centers of inquiry which contribute to the knowledge base which informs good practice; and 3) as induction schools designed to support and transmit high standards for professional practice. A better education for student can be the outcome."

Critical Thinking Curriculum: Roberts Avenue Elementary School and Western Connecticut State University

In 1986, the Center for Developmental Studies, at Western Connecticut State University was created to spawn a variety of collaborative projects. The Center's Board of Directors includes of local superintendents, teachers, and WESConn faculty, the Dean of Professional Studies at WESConn and RESCUE. Over the last three years, funding for the Center's activities has come from three primary sources--seed money from the university, tuition fees charged to program participants and grants from Connecticut State University's Center for Educational Excellence (CEE). Frequently, the Center for Developmental Studies enters into formal service agreements with the public schools, which provides an additional source of revenue.

One of the many collaborative projects sponsored by the Center and funded by the CEE has been the Critical Thinking

Curriculum Program at the Roberts Avenue Elementary School in Danbury. Faculty and administrators at Roberts Avenue, which is known for its high concentration of at-risk students, have been keenly aware of the need to incorporate critical thinking skills into the curriculum. With this as their key objective, faculty identified a course of action with the assistance of a Reading and Cognitive Development Specialist at Western Connecticut State University. Working in tandem to conceptualize the project, faculty from both institutions developed a three-phase process that began in the fall of 1988.

Phase One consisted of bi-weekly professional development activities with Roberts Avenue faculty. During once a week seminar sessions, the WesConn professor, Joseph Cillizza taught faculty various methods for teaching Critical Thinking Skills. In addition, he taught Critical Thinking Skills in elementary classrooms with the regular teachers present as observers.

During the spring semester of 1988-89 (Phase Two of the project), faculty developed curriculum materials using the concepts learned earlier. Concurrent with the project, several of the faculty members participated in Dr. Cillizza's Cognitive Development course at WESConn. (Five of the faculty received credit for the course).

The final Phase of the project is now underway as Roberts Avenue teachers are using the critical thinking materials they created during the 1988-89 school year. At the end of this school year, students will be given a post-test, measuring their critical thinking skills to determine the progress made since the September pre-test.

Observations: Initial meetings were attended by the Dean of professional Studies and Chair of the Education Department at WESConn: This level of university participation appears to have been instrumental in developing a relationship based on mutual

trust. Since both WESConn and Roberts Avenue Elementary School were involved in all aspects of the planning and implementation of the project, one of the challenges was how to synchronize schedules so key representatives could participate on a regular basis.

Because an established mechanism was in place (the Center for Developmental Studies), the University was able to respond in a timely manner to the identified needs of an urban school. Although a specific goal of the project was to develop critical thinking curriculum materials for Roberts Avenue students, both institutions benefited as did individual teachers. The fact that Professor Cillizza was actually teaching at Roberts Avenue increased his credibility with Western's graduate students. Also, by observing him in the classroom, pre-service teachers had many opportunities for linking theory and practice. Overall, the experience has strengthened the teaching of members of the Roberts Avenue faculty, who have earned continuing education units (CEU's) for participation in the project.

International Studies Magnet School: Hillhouse High School, New Haven and Yale University

In July of 1989, The New Haven public schools received a U.S. Department of Education grant to fund four magnet schools. One of the Schools, Hillhouse High School, was designated the International Studies magnet school and received $84,000 from the grant. The stated purpose of this project is twofold: 1) to provide a curriculum in three critical languages - Japanese, Chinese and Russian, and 2) to promote voluntary desegregation.

Upon receiving the grant, the program facilitator, a teacher of the gifted and talented at Hillhouse, contacted the

Yale Center for International Studies to form a program management team. The core team consists of the facilitator, the Associate Director of the Yale Center for International Studies, the Director of the Yale Teacher Preparation Program, as well as additional district personnel and faculty from the Yale Center.

Since the Yale Center for International Studies is already involved in extensive outreach and the development of curriculum materials for the New Haven Schools, the program provides a unique opportunity consistent with the Center's mandate. By involving both the Center and the yale teacher preparation program, content knowledge (e.g., Asian cultures and languages) is linked with pedagogical expertise.

Observations: The timetable for the program has required a round-the-clock effort by the collaborators. During the 1989-90 academic year, over 100 students from at least fifteen different public, private, and parochial schools have attended after school classes for academic credit.

1) Given the initial success of the programs, efforts are currently underway to acquire additional outside funding for expanding the program. Members of the core team are eager to develop a national model.

APPENDIX C

Survey on Partnerships in Connecticut

Institution_____
Please check the appropriate response or supply short answers.

1. The number of undergraduates enrolled in teacher preparation at my institution is _____; graduates_____.

2. In the last 5 years, change in the level of partnerships between my institution and schools could be characterized as
   _____no significant difference
   _____some increase in activity
   _____steady activity
   _____substantial on-going activity

3. I would characterize faculty commitment to partnerships as
   ____none ____low ____average ____strong

4. In terms of priorities of our school or department, the development of partnerships has ranked
   ____low _____medium ____high

5. The reasons or incentives that prompt us to undertake partnership activities include

6. The major obstacles to developing partnerships have been

7. The degree to which program approval standards have influenced our decision to initiate partnership activities is
   ____none ____low ____somewhat ____high

8. As the CEE and IET set funding priorities for the 1990-91 academic year, the priority given to supporting partnership activities should be
   ____none ____low ____medium ____high

9. In the area of partnerships, the education programs would benefit most from the following (please check top 3 priorities):
   ____incentive awards
   ____information on successful collaborations
   ____workshops on developing partnerships
   ____opportunities for interaction with national experts
   ____sponsored faculty research on dimensions of partnership
   ____conference on school restructuring
   ____other

10. Additional comments

Thank you for your assistance.

Appendix D

TABLES

Table 1 Responses to Survey Question #1: Percentage of Institutions With Enrollment in Teacher Preparation at Indicated Level
n=11

Students	Undergraduate	Graduate
0-99	27%	36%
100-199	9%	18%
200-299	18%	9%
300-399	9%	9%
400-499	9%	0
500-599	0	0
600-699	0	0
700-799	0	0
800-899	0	0
900-999	0	0
1000-1499	9%	0
1500-1999	9%	18%

Table 2 Responses to Survey Question #2: Change in Level of Partnership Activity in Last 5 Years at My Institution
n=11

Level	Percentage Response
no significant change	0
some activity increase	27%
steady activity	36%
substantial activity	36%

Table 3 Responses to Survey Question #3: Characterization of Faculty Commitment to Partnerships
n=11

Level	Percentage Response
none	0
low	0
average	64%
strong	36%

Table 4 Responses to Survey Question #4: Prioritization of Partnership Development in the Teacher Preparation Department
n=11

Level	Percentage Response
low	9%
medium	64%
high	27%

Table 5 Ranking of Responses to Survey Question #5: Incentives for Undertaking Partnerships
n=11

Incentive	Percentage Institutional Respondents
institutional initiative	27%
essential need	27%
faculty initiative	27%
program approval incentives	18%
accreditation	18%
outside support	18%
strong leadership	9%
service	9%
research	9%

Table 6 Responses to Survey Question # 6: Obstacles to Developing Partnerships
n=11

Obstacle	Percentage Institutional Respondents
lack of funding support	64%
lack of time	73%
lack of faculty	55%
bureaucracy	18%

Table 7 Responses to Survey Question #7: Degree to Which Program Approval Standards Influence Development of Partnerships
n=11

Degree	Percentage Institutional Respondents
none	9%
low	36%
somewhat	45%
high	9%

Table 8 Responses to Survey Question #8: Priority that CEE and IET Should Give to Supporting Partnerships

Degree	Percentage Institutional Respondents
none	9%
low	9%
medium	27%
high	55%

Table 9 Responses to Survey Question #9: Rank ordering of Support Given to Partnership Development
n=11

Activity suggestion	Percentage Institutional Respondents
incentive awards	73%
information on partnerships	36%
workshops on partnerships	18%
interaction opportunities	36%
sponsored research	0
conference on restructuring	64%